arXiv:1402.5952v1 [math.GM] 24 Feb 2014

On The Riemann Hypothesis *

Mingchun Xu
School of Mathematics, South-China Normal University,
Guangzhou, 510631, China
E-mail:xumch@scnu.edu.cn

Abstract

We consider the alternating Riemann zeta function $\zeta^*(s)$ for $\mathcal{R}(s) > 0$. By using a theorem of Hurwitz for the analytic functions and a theorem due to T.J.Stieltjes and I. Schur, we prove $\zeta^*(s)$ never vanishes on $\frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{R}(s) < 1$. We have seen that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros for $\mathcal{R}(s) > 1$. It was proved independently by Hadamard and de la Vallée Poussin in 1896 that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros on the line $\mathcal{R}(s) = 1$. Hence $\zeta(s)$ has all the complex zeros only on the line $\mathcal{R}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ from the functional equation for the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$. This completes the proof of the Riemann Hypothesis.

2010 MR Subject Classification 11M06,11M41

1 Introduction

The distribution of prime numbers is an old problem in number theory. It is very easy to state but extremely hard to resolve . In his famous paper written in 1859 Bernhard Riemann connected this problem with a function investigated earlier by Leonhard Euler. He also formulated certain hypothesis concerning the distribution of complex zeros of this function. At first this hypothesis appeared as a relatively simple analytical conjecture to be proved sooner rather than later. However, future development of the theory proved otherwise: since then the Riemann hypothesis (hereafter called RH) is commonly regarded as both the most challenging and the most difficult task in number theory. It states that all complex zeros of the zeta function, defined by the following series if the real part $\mathcal{R}(s) > 1$

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \tag{1}$$

*Project supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China(Grant No. 11171118).

and by analytic continuation to the whole plane, are located right on the critical line $\mathcal{R}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$. For a rich history of the Riemann hypothesis and some recent developments, see Bombieri[1], Conrey[2], and Sarnark[5].

In this paper, we prove the following result.

Main Theorem All nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function lie on the critical line $\mathcal{R}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$.

The Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ is analytic in the complex plane (s-plane), except for a simple pole at $s = 1$. The alternating zeta function $\zeta^*(s)$ is defined as the analytic continuation of the Dirichlet series

$$\zeta^*(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n^s}, \tag{2}$$

which converges if $\mathcal{R}(s) > 0$. The two functions are related to for $\mathcal{R}(s) > 0$ by the identity

$$\zeta^*(s) = (1 - 2^{1-s})\zeta(s), \tag{3}$$

which is easily established, first for $\mathcal{R}(s) > 1$ by combining terms in the convergent Dirichlet series, and then by using analytic continuation to extend $\mathcal{R}(s) > 0$. The factor $1 - 2^{1-s}$ has a simple zero at $s = 1$ that cancels the pole of $\zeta(s)$, so (3) shows that $\zeta^*(s)$ is an entire function of s. It vanishes at each zero of the factor $1 - 2^{1-s}$ with the exception of $s = 1$, at which point $\zeta^*(1) = ln\, 2$. The other zeros of factor $1 - 2^{1-s}$ are called also trivial zeros of $\zeta^*(s)$, which lie on the line $\mathcal{R}(s) = 1$ and occur at the points at $s = 1 + \frac{2k\pi}{ln2}i$ for all nonzero integers k. All nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are the same as that of $\zeta^*(s)$.

2 Some theory of Analytic Functions

In this paper a metric is put on the set of all analytic functions on a fixed region G, and compactness and convergence in this metric space is discussed. For further detail see[3].

Let (Ω, d) denote a complete metric space.

Definition If G is an open set in $\mathbb{C}$ and (Ω, d) is a complete metric space then $C(G, \Omega)$ denotes the set all continuous functions from G to Ω.

Lemma 2.1 *(see[3],Chapter VII,1.2 Proposition) If G is an open set in $\mathbb{C}$ then there is sequence $\{K_n\}$ of compact subsets of and G such that $G = \bigsqcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$. Moreover, the sets K_n can be chosen to satisfy the following conditions:*

(a) $K_n \subset int\ K_{n+1}$;

(b) $K \subset G$ and K compact implies $K \subset K_n$ for some n;

(c) Every component of $\mathbb{C}_\infty - K_n$ contains a component of $\mathbb{C}_\infty - G$.

Definition If $G = \bigsqcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ where each$\{K_n\}$ is compact and $K_n \subset int\ K_{n+1}$ as the above lemma, define

$$\rho_n(f,g) = sup\{d(f(z),g(z))|z \in K_n\}$$

for all functions f and g in $C(G,\Omega)$. Also define

$$\rho(f,g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2})^n \frac{\rho_n(f,g)}{1+\rho_n(f,g)}.$$

Lemma 2.2 *(see[3],Chapter VII,1.6 Proposition) $(C(G,\Omega),\rho)$ is metric space.*

Lemma 2.3 *(see[3],Chapter VII,1.10 Proposition) A sequence $\{f_n\}$ in $(C(G,\Omega),\rho)$ converges to f if and only if $\{f_n\}$ converges to f uniformly on all compact subsets of G.*

Definition If G is an open set in $\mathbb{C}$ then $H(G)$ denotes the set all analytic functions. We will always assume that the metric on $H(G)$ is the metric which it inherits as a subset of $C(G,\Omega)$.

Lemma 2.4 *(see[3],Chapter VII,2.1 Theorem) If $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence in $H(G)$ and f belongs to $(C(G,\Omega),\rho)$ such that f_n converges to f then f is analytic and $f_n^{(k)} \longrightarrow f^{(k)}$ for each integer $k \geq 1$.*

Lemma 2.5 *(1) (see[3],Chapter VII,1.12 Proposition) $(C(G,\Omega),\rho)$ is complete metric space.*

(2) (see[3],Chapter VII,2.3 Corollary) $H(G)$ is complete metric space.

Lemma 2.6 *(Hurwitz, see[6], 3.45. A theorem of Hurwitz) Let $f_n(s)$ be a sequence of functions, each analytic in a region D bounded by a simple closed contour, and let $f_n(s) \to f(s)$ uniformly in D. Suppose that $f(s)$ is not identically zero. Let s_0 be an interior point of D. Then s_0 is a zero of $f(s)$ if, and only if, it is a limit-point of the set of zeros of the functions $f_n(s)$, points which are zeros for an infinity of values of n being counted as limit-points.*

As a consequence it follows the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7 *(Hurwitz, see[3],2.6 Corollary) If G is a region and $\{f_n\} \subset H(G)$ converges to f in $H(G)$ and each $f_n(s)$ never vanishes on G then either $f \equiv 0$ or f never vanishes on G.*

Lemma 2.8 *(Vitali's convergence theorem, see[6], 5.21) Let $f_n(s)$ be a sequence of functions, each regular in a region D; let*

$$|f_n(s)| \leq M$$

for every n and s in D; and let $f_n(s)$ tend to a limit, as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, at a set of points having a limit-point inside D. Then $f_n(s)$ tends uniformly to a limit in any region bounded by a contour interior to D, the limit being, therefore, an analytic function of s.

Lemma 2.9 *(Vitali's convergence theorem, see[6], 5.22) From any sequence of functions regular and bounded in a region D, in the sense of the above lemma, we can select a sub-sequence which converges uniformly in any region bounded by a contour interior to D.*

By a Dirichlet series we mean a series of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n^s},$$

where the coefficients a_n are any given numbers, and s is complex variable.

Lemma 2.10 *(see[6], 9.11) If the Dirichlet series is convergent for $s = s_0$, then it is uniformly convergent throughout the angular region in the s-plane defined by the inequality*

$$|arg(s - s_0)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi - \delta,$$

where δ is any positive number less than $\frac{1}{2}\pi$.

We need the following key Lemma, due to T.J.Stieltjes and I. Schur, in order to prove the Riemann Hypothesis.

Lemma 2.11 *(T.J.Stieltjes, I. Schur, see[4], Part III problem 46) If a series $u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_n + \cdots$ is absolutely convergent and a series $v_1 + v_2 + \cdots + v_n + \cdots$ is convergent, then Dirichlet product*

$$u_1v_1 + (u_1v_2 + u_2v_1) + (u_1v_3 + u_3v_1) + \cdots + \sum_{t|n} u_t v_{n/t} + \cdots$$

is also a convergent series.

Proof. (Sketch) Let V_n and W_n be the partial sums of the series

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n \text{ and } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{t|n} u_t v_{\frac{n}{t}}.$$

Now (see[4],VIII 81)

$$W_n = u_1V_n + u_2V_{[\frac{n}{2}]} + u_3V_{[\frac{n}{3}]} + \cdots + u_nV_{[\frac{n}{n}]}, n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots$$

The coefficient of V_k is equal to the sum of those u_l's for which $[\frac{n}{l}] = k$. Set $\nu = [\sqrt{n}]$. For those values of l which are less or equal to ν the coefficient of $V_{[\frac{n}{l}]}$ is precisely u_l. This follows from the fact that for $2 \leq l \leq \nu$

$$\frac{n}{l-1} - \frac{n}{l} = \frac{n}{l(l-1)} > \frac{n}{l^2} \geq 1.$$

In order that the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients in the n-th row be bounded the same must hold for $|u_1|+|u_2|+\cdots+|u_\nu|$, that is, $u_1+u_2+\cdots+u_n+\cdots$ is absolutely convergent. Hence the validity of the other condition (see[4],Part III problem 44) follows, and so the absolute convergence of the series is the desired necessary and sufficient condition.

3 Proof of the Main Theorem

Denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the set of all prime numbers. Let $\eta(s) = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}((1-p^{-s})e^{p^{-s}})$.

Step 1 For $\mathcal{R}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\eta(s)$ is analytic.

If $\mathcal{R}(s) \geq a > \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$|log((1-p^{-s})e^{p^{-s}})| = |p^{-s} + log(1-p^{-s})| = |p^{-s} - p^{-s} - \frac{1}{2}p^{-2s} - \frac{1}{3}p^{-3s} - \cdots|$$

$$= |-\frac{1}{2}p^{-2s} - \frac{1}{3}p^{-3s} - \cdots| \leq \frac{1}{2}(|p^{-2s}| + |p^{-3s}| + \cdots) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{|p^{-2s|}}{1-|p^{-s}|} \leq \frac{1}{p^{2a}}$$

for all sufficiently large values of p and with $|p^{-s}| < \frac{1}{2}$. Note that $\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{-2a}$ is convergent for $a > \frac{1}{2}$.

As $u \to 0$, $(1-u)e^u = 1 + O(u^2)$. Since the series $\sum |p^{-2s}|$ converges uniformly to a bounded sum, we have $\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}((1-p^{-s})e^{p^{-s}})$ is uniformly and absolutely convergent in region $\mathcal{R}(s) \geq a > \frac{1}{2}$ (see §1.43 and §1.44 in [6]).

Let $G = \{s|\mathcal{R}(s) > \frac{1}{2}\}$ and

$$f_n(s) = \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}, p\leq n} (1-p^{-s})e^{p^{-s}}.$$

Then $f_n(s)$ convergent to $\eta(s)$ in $H(G)$.

§1.43 and §1.44 in [6] imply that $f_n(s)$ is uniformly convergent for each compact subset in the right plane $\mathcal{R}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$. Lemma 2.3 implies that $f_n(s)$ convergent to $\eta(s)$ in $H(G)$.

For $\mathcal{R}(s) > \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\eta(s)$ is analytic.

Step 2 Then $f_n(s)$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.7. That is each $f_n(s)$ does not vanish on G and $\eta(s)$ is not identically zero. So $\eta(s)$ does not vanish on G by Lemma 2.7.

Step 3 By Lemma 2.11 we have that

$$f_n(s) * \zeta^*(s) = (1 - 2^{1-s} + \frac{a_{n+1}}{(n+1)^s} + \cdots) * exp(\sum_{p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{-s}) = g_n(s) * exp(h_n(s)), \quad (4)$$

where $s \in G = \{s | \mathcal{R}(s) > \frac{1}{2}\}$,

$$g_n(s) = 1 - 2^{1-s} + \frac{a_{n+1}}{(n+1)^s} + \cdots \quad (5)$$

$$h_n(s) = \sum_{p \leq n, p \in \mathcal{P}} p^{-s}. \quad (6)$$

To prove (5), Lemma 2.11 implies that $g_n(s)$ as a Dirichlet series is convergent for $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ since $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}, p \leq n}(1 - p^{-s})$ is absolutely convergent and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n^s}$ is convergent.

Step 4 Let $D = \{s | \frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{R}(s) < 1\}$ and s_0 be any interior point of D. Let Γ_0 be a circle with center s_0 and positive radius r_0 lying entirely in D.

Case (i) There is a positive M with respect to s_0; and there is a sub-sequence $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k, \cdots$ such that

$$\mathcal{R}(h_{n_k}(s)) \leq M$$

for every n_k and $s \in \{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$.

By Lemma 2.9, we can select a sub-sequence which converges uniformly in any region interior to $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$ from the sequence of functions $exp(h_{n_k}(s))$, the limit being an analytic function $exp(h(s))$. Denote this sequence $exp(h_{m_l}(s))$. Since $f_n(s)$ is convergent to $\eta(s)$, then (4) implies that $g_{m_l}(s)$ are bounded in $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$, in the sense of lemma 2.8. By Lemma 2.9, we can select a sub-sequence which converges uniformly in any region interior to $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$ from the sequence of functions $g_{m_l}(s))$, the limit being an analytic function $1 - 2^{1-s}$. By Lemma 2.6 $\eta(s) * \zeta^*(s)$ has no zeros in $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$. So $\zeta^*(s)$ has no zeros in $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$ by Step 2.

Case (ii) Suppose that case (i) does not occur. By Lemma 2.10 we have that $h_n(s)$ is divergent in $\{z | |z - s_0| < r_0\}$ because $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ is divergent. Then there is a sub-sequence $n_1, n_2, \cdots, n_k, \cdots$ such that

$$0 \leq \mathcal{R}(h_{n_k}(s))$$

for every n_k and $s \in \{z||z-s_0| < r_0\}$. Since $f_n(s)$ is convergent to $\eta(s)$, then (4) implies that $g_{n_k}(s)$ are bounded in $\{z||z - s_0| < r_0\}$, in the sense of lemma 2.8. By Lemma 2.9, we can select a sub-sequence which converges uniformly in any region interior to $\{z||z - s_0| < r_0\}$ from the sequence of functions $g_{n_k}(s))$, the limit being an analytic function $1 - 2^{1-s}$. So $\zeta^*(s)$ has no zeros in $\{z||z - s_0| < r_0\}$ by (4).

Finally $\zeta^*(s)$ has no zeros in $D = \{s|\frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{R}(s) < 1\}$.

Step 5 Since all nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are the same as that of $\zeta^*(s)$ and Step 4, $\zeta(s)$ does not vanish on $D = \{s|\frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{R}(s) < 1\}$. We have seen that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros for $\mathcal{R}(s) > 1$. It then follows from the functional equation that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros for $\mathcal{R}(s) < 0$ except for simple zeros at $s = -2, -4, -6, \cdots$. It was proved independently by Hadamard and de la Vallée Poussin in 1896 that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros on the line $\mathcal{R}(s) = 1$. Hence $\zeta(s)$ has all the complex zeros only on the line $\mathcal{R}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ from the functional equation for the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$(see[7], Theorem 2.1).

This completes the proof of the theorem.

References

[1] Bombieri, E., Problems of the millennium: The Riemann hypothesis, www.claymath.org.

[2] Conrey, B., The Riemann hypothesis, Notices of the AMS, March, 2003, 341-353.

[3] Conway, J. B., Functions of one complex variable, Springger-Verlag,GTM 11: 1973.

[4] Polya, G., Szego, G., Problems and Theorems in analysis(vol 1), Springger-Verlag, 1972.

[5] P. Sarnak, Problems of the Millennium: The Riemann hypothesis (2004), www.claymath.org.

[6] Titchmarsh, E. C., The Theorey of functions, Oxford science publication, 1947.

[7] Titchmarsh, E. C., The Theorey of the Riemann zeta-function, Oxford science publication, 1986.